

KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 16, 2004

Unapproved DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini
William Beck
Robert Beckwith
Don Freas
Mark Hooper
Max Pope
Ray Schlien
Shirley Shimada
Judy Stenberg
Joe Tessier
Dave Whitley

Others in Attendance

Mark Buscher
Jeff Gaisford
Beth Humphreys
Kevin Kiernan
Kathryn Killinger
Mary Lang
Tami Litras
Diane Yates

Members Absent

Steve Goldstein
Jerry Hardebeck
Jim Hodge

Action Items

Lines 13-14: Unanimous approval of November minutes

Lines 16-18: Table approval of October Ad Hoc Committee minutes until the February meeting

Lines 50-52: Unanimous vote approving Judy Stenberg as SWAC chair for 2004

Lines 54-55: Unanimous vote approving Mark Hooper as SWAC vice chair for 2004

Lines 57-59: Unanimous vote approving Mark Hooper as chair of the WRR subcommittee for 2004

Lines 61-62: Unanimous vote approving Shirley Shimada as vice chair of the WRR subcommittee for 2004

Lines 64-65: Unanimous vote approving Bob Beckwith as chair of the F&O subcommittee for 2004

Lines 67-68: Unanimous vote approving Jerry Hardebeck as vice chair of the F&O subcommittee for 2004

Lines 185-186: Table discussion of Conflict of Interest procedures until the February meeting

Lines 330 – 332: Add Northeast Lake Washington Service Area discussion to February F&O subcommittee meeting.

1 **Call to Order**

2 Chair Stenberg called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

3

4 **Introductions**

5 SWAC members and others in attendance introduced themselves.

6

7 SWAC staff liaison, Diane Yates, announced that George Raffle would no longer be

8 representing Teamsters Local 174 on SWAC. Local 174 elected new leadership and would be

9 appointing a new representative to the committee. In the meantime, Solid Waste Division
10 employee and Local 174 member Mary Lang would be attending meetings as a guest.

11
12 **Approve Minutes and Review Agenda**

13 **SWAC vice chair Mark Hooper moved approval of the November 2003 minutes.**

14 **The motion passed unanimously.**

15
16 **SWAC member Dave Whitley moved to table review and approval of the October 24th Ad**
17 **Hoc Subcommittee meeting minutes until the February 2004 meeting. The motion passed**
18 **unanimously.**

19
20 **Subcommittee Reports**

21 **WRR Subcommittee**

22 Mark Hooper reported on the four topics discussed at the November WRR subcommittee
23 meeting including electronics legislation, Waste Free Holidays, Christmas tree recycling, and
24 food waste recycling.

25
26 *Electronics Legislation:*

27 Hooper said that electronics legislation is on the current legislative agenda. Proposed legislation
28 includes a broader definition of electronic waste; a ban on disposal; a phase out of; and
29 language assigning responsibility for disposal to manufacturers.

30
31 *Christmas Tree Recycling:*

32 This is the last year the Division will be providing the Christmas tree chipping program. The
33 decision was made to eliminate the program since residents have curbside collection options.

34
35 *Food Waste Recycling:*

36 A number of cities including Kirkland, Redmond and Bellevue have included food waste
37 recycling in their new collection contracts. SWAC member Ray Schlienzy discussed how the
38 program is working in Kirkland.

39
40
41 **Facilities and Operations Subcommittee**

42 SWAC member Bob Beckwith discussed this morning's discussion about the impacts of last
43 week's snow and ice storm on solid waste facilities. Transfer trucks were kept off the roads

because of the icy road conditions, and downed trees and power lines in several areas. Transfer stations were able to continue operating thanks to staff's hard work.

Nominations and Election of 2004 Chairs and Vice Chairs

SWAC chair Judy Stenberg asked members for nominations for chairs and vice chairs.

SWAC member Carolyn Armanini nominated Judy Stenberg for a second term as chair of the full SWAC. SWAC member Max Pope moved for a unanimous ballot. The motion passed unanimously.

SWAC member Dave Whitley nominated Mark Hooper for a second term as vice chair of the full SWAC. Pope moved for a unanimous ballot. The motion passed unanimously

SWAC member Shirley Shimada nominated Mark Hooper for chair of the Waste Reduction/Recycling Subcommittee. Pope moved for a unanimous ballot. The motion passed unanimously.

Armanini nominated Shimada for vice chair of the WRR subcommittee. The motion passed unanimously.

Pope nominated SWAC member Bob Beckwith for a second term as chair of the Facilities and Operations subcommittee. The motion passed unanimously.

Whitley nominated SWAC member Jerry Hardebeck for a second term as vice chair of the Facilities and Operations subcommittee. The motion passes unanimously.

Recycling Legislation Update

Senior planner Beth Humphreys briefed the committee on the current legislative session and recycling legislation that has been introduced. The session began on January 12, 2004 and will last 60 days. All bills must be out of their house of origin by February 6th.

HB 1705 and SB 6262: Tire Recycling. These bills would create a fund to clean up tire piles, which are a concern due to West Nile Virus. The house bill establishes a fee of \$ 0.75 per tire; the senate bill establishes a fee of \$3.00 per tire. HB 1705 would sunset after five years.

HB1743: Insurance Requirements. Requires insurance for companies that process hazardous waste to ensure they have enough insurance to cover the costs of a clean up.

HB 2487 and 2488: Electronic Waste Disposal Bans. Both bills relate to last year's bill 1942 which was introduced by Representative Mike Cooper of Snohomish County.

HB 2487 would ban landfill disposal of electronic waste including computer processing units (CPUs), computer monitors, and televisions. The landfill ban would be statewide and would go into effect 1/1/06. There is a lot of opposition to the bill in Eastern Washington. There is concern that there is no infrastructure for recycling electronics. Electronics disposal is not perceived as a big issue now but it will be in the future.

HB 2488 is a product stewardship bill and would require manufacturer responsibility for collection of electronic products. It sets up a timeline for manufacturers to develop collection and recycling programs for their products. Plans would not be required to take effect until 2007 and only 20 percent would have to be recycled in the first year. Over a period of five years manufacturers would be required to recycle 70 percent of their products. The bill requires that products have a label listing toxic components. The bill also contains language about exporting these products for recycling to ensure that the materials are handled in an environmentally sound manner. This could be the impetus for economic development in Washington and the creation of new businesses.

The bill sets up an interim process for collection of fees. \$5.00 would be charged at point of purchase. Fees could represent as much as \$8 million in the first five years. The fees would go into a fund to be managed by the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED). The money would go towards grants and loans to help small businesses set up recycling programs. A committee would be established to decide how the funds would be distributed. This process would remain in effect for five years.

Both bills were introduced on January 15th. There will be a hearing on the 23rd. SWD will testify at the hearing. There is a lot of opposition to the bills and substitute bills will be introduced. To date there have been two stakeholders' meetings that did not result in agreement.

Jeff Gaisford said that, overall, SWD is happy with the bills. SWD supports shared responsibility and would like to see manufacturers, retailers, consumers and government all play a role in the proper disposal and recycling of these materials.

114 Whitley asked how fees would be collected on internet sales.
115 Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Section Manager, responded that the bill
116 does not address internet sales.
117
118 In response to a question, Humphreys said that DVD players and VCRs are not covered by the
119 bills. These products contain significantly less toxic materials than other products.
120
121 In response to a question, Humphreys said that SWD currently bans computer monitors from
122 commercial companies.
123
124 Hooper asked about the outlook for passage of this bill.
125
126 Humphreys said the outlook is not good but there's always hope. Representative Cooper has
127 done a lot of work on this and reached out to a number of groups.
128
129 Armanini said she would be happy to assist in finding a sponsor in the senate if needed.
130
131 SWAC member Joe Tessier said that the World Trade Organization (WTO) doesn't have these
132 environmental protections. They could choose to set the bills requirements aside. Are we just
133 spinning our wheels here?
134
135 Shimada said that it's an educational process and important that attention be placed on the issue.
136
137 Humphreys said that California has passed a similar bill and other states are also working on
138 similar legislation.
139
140 Gaisford said that if a number of states pass bills the stakeholders might be more inclined to opt
141 for national standards.
142
143 SWAC member Don Freas asked if any manufacturers have proposed any plans or programs.
144 Gaisford responded that Hewlett Packard has indicated they will set up a plan for their products.
145 Whitley asked how the waste is classified in the proposed legislation.
146
147 Humphreys said that while this waste tests hazardous it is not specifically designated hazardous
148 waste under current law.

149 *SHB 2308*: Passed last year and codified in RCW 81.77, this law is the result of concern about a
150 drop in the statewide recycling rate. It encourages the commercial waste management
151 companies that are regulated by the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission
152 (WUTC) to collect more recyclable materials by allowing the companies to keep 30 percent
153 more of the recycling revenue they collect. It is up to the each company to propose how they
154 will participate. The County's role is to certify that the waste management companies' plans are
155 consistent with the Comprehensive Solid Waste Plan. The WUTC approves each hauler's plan.
156 This is viewed as a pilot program. The WUTC is required to report the results of the program to
157 the state legislature by the end of 2005. King County has approved plans for the two major
158 waste management companies, Waste Management and Allied.

159
160 Waste Management's program went into effect summer 2003. The company's goal is to
161 increase recycling collection rates 4 percent by next year. They have implemented single stream
162 recycling, which means that glass is collected in the same container as the other recyclables.
163 Waste Management has agreed to work with the County to also make food waste collection
164 more universally available. Pre-implementation waste sorts have been completed and post
165 implementation waste sorts will be done to gauge the results of the program. The new law
166 affected all Waste Management's franchise areas in King County. This could result in an
167 increase of \$400,000 in Waste Management's annual revenues. In the first couple months of the
168 plan's implementation Waste Management has seen a significant increase in recycling.

169
170 Allied's (Eastside Disposal) plan is for the unincorporated area of Juanita adjacent to the City of
171 Kirkland. They are also implementing single stream recycling collection and will begin
172 collecting food waste and soiled containers. Gaisford said that Allied already has the highest
173 recycling collection rates in King County's solid waste system. They anticipate generating
174 approximately \$80,000 annually from 23,000 customers as a result of this plan.

175
176 SWAC member Bill Beck asked if the Division had any plans to add collection of other
177 recyclables such as food waste at the transfer stations.

178
179 Gaisford said that the Division is looking at the recycling services that are provided at the
180 transfer stations. We are also looking at adding yard waste collection at stations. The Division
181 has not looked at adding food waste.

184 **Conflict of Interest Procedures**

185 **Whitley moved to defer the discussion of conflict of interest procedures until the February**
186 **meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**

187
188 **SWD Changes Update**

189 Kevin Kiernan, Solid Waste Division Engineering Services Manager, gave an update on
190 proposed SWD changes. Since the last SWAC meeting in November, the Solid Waste Omnibus
191 Ordinance and Solid Waste budget were passed as proposed. Quarterly reporting requirements
192 were added to the ordinance to provide for regular updates to council on how the changes are
193 working.

194
195 *Reporting Requirements*

196 The Division will be forwarding notice of intent to change rural transfer station operating hours
197 to council on March 1st so the change in hours can go into effect on April 1st. Notice of the
198 proposed change in urban station hours will go to council on May 1st for an effective date of
199 June 1st.

200
201 Notice of the increase in the Regional Direct Rate has gone out to the waste management
202 companies.

203
204 The Division will be posting notice of ancillary fees for the commercial haulers, such as tire
205 replacement charges, at Cedar Hills.

206
207 The first annual report on the Zero Waste of Resources goal is due to council on April 1, 2005.

208
209 With adoption of the Omnibus Ordinance the Division will be briefing the Regional Policy
210 Committee (RPC) throughout the year.

211
212 *Transportation Plan*

213 Currently the Division stores loaded trailers overnight at the transfer stations. Under the new
214 plan, the transfer trailers will take their loads to Cedar Hills where they will be stored overnight
215 for disposal the next day. This will allow us to even out the flow of waste.

217 In response to a question, Kiernan said the Division will have to work around the evening rush
218 hour. The plan will be adjusted as needed. He said the Division doesn't want trucks sitting in
219 rush hour traffic.

221 The Division has also met with both haulers about the proposed changes and has offered to try
222 to match our hours to their needs if it's economical. Both companies have agreed to give us data
223 on their hauling needs by the end of January.

225 Tessier asked if Waste Management has decided to sell Eastmont.

227 Kiernan said that Waste Management is focusing on recycling at Eastmont and will be bringing
228 garbage to the Division's transfer stations.

230 *Staffing/Layoff Update*

231 The Division held a series of all hands meetings for staff earlier this month to discuss the
232 changes that will be implemented, to acknowledge the challenges facing the Division, and to let
233 employees know that schedules will be changing but we don't know how they will change yet.

235 Tessier asked if changes in schedules can't be determined until the Division knows what the
236 haulers' needs are.

238 Kiernan said that was correct for the urban stations. The Division is confident about the changes
239 at the rural stations.

241 Kiernan told the Committee that 16 of the 35 staff that received lay off notices remain to be
242 placed. Three of those employees have interviews scheduled. The majority of the staff who have
243 not yet been placed are truck drivers and transfer station operators.

245 **Waste Export Coordination and Implementation Plan**

246 Mark Buscher gave a presentation on the Framework for development of the Waste Export Plan
247 and said he would attend the February SWAC meeting to take members' comments.

249 Buscher said that the 2001 adopted Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Solid Waste
250 Plan) recommends the move to waste export once Cedar Hills reaches capacity and closes. The

Framework is the first step in the process. The Plan will be developed this year for submittal to the King County Council in December 2004.

The Waste Export Plan will identify the best means possible to develop the physical facilities to handle the system's waste. If existing private sector intermodals don't have capacity or are not cost effective, then the Division will do a full siting study and the Harbor Island property will be one of the sites considered. The Division will also look at a centralized compaction facility to see if it is more cost-effective than installing compactors at all the transfer stations.

Armanini asked what kind of assurances the public has that it will be a clean process and not a fait accompli? Has the Executive pre-determined that Harbor Island is the preferred site?

Buscher responded that the Division has been directed to work with all interested parties including the cities, King County Council, and the transportation and waste management industries and incorporate their input into the Plan. Solicitation of input is required by ordinance.

Tessier said that the Executive has told labor that development of the Harbor Island property is not a fait accompli.

Kiernan said that the authority to purchase the property was by ordinance which required Council approval and adoption of the Waste Export Plan. That will bring the process to the public for discussion. The Division will need to defend its process.

Armanini commented that it will be important to provide SWAC with a full range of information so it can provide input and ensure that SWAC isn't a funnel to a predetermined decision.

In response to a question Buscher said that an intermodal facility will need to be operational by the time Cedar Hills closes.

SWAC member Ray SchlienZ commented that Department Director Pam Bissonnette said at council last Monday, January 12th, that it takes ten years to site and build a new transfer station. SchlienZ said he thought that siting an intermodal could take longer.

Buscher responded that an intermodal would not be more difficult to site. A transfer station is sited to serve the residents and businesses around it. An intermodal is sited in a heavy industrial area. There are not the same kinds of potential impacts.

Kiernan said that with potential increases in the recycling rate as a result of single stream recycling and the economic downturn Cedar Hills could last longer than the projected 2012 closing data. The Division will be bringing this issue to SWAC later this year.

Northeast King County Service Area

Schlienz began the discussion saying he talked to Kevin Kiernan earlier this week about Houghton. Schlienz said he is concerned that the Division does short range planning but talks about long range planning – as has been done on the intermodal. The Division is band aiding facilities instead of developing a broad strategy and being responsive to system growth.

Schlienz went on to discuss email communication between the head of the Houghton Neighborhood Association and King County Councilmember Hague and council staff member Peggy Dorothy. In the email, Dorothy indicates that repealing adopted Ordinance 11949 (1995) is not necessary to change direction on plans for Houghton. She goes on to say that the adopted 2001 Solid Waste Plan provides for alternatives in policies RTS 2 and RTS 3, including a new transfer station. Council motion 11601 established detailed level of service criteria for transfer stations and determined that Houghton was operating at service level E.

SWAC member Don Freas asked if staff can respond to the issues Schlienz is raising at the next meeting.

Armanini said she would also like to see some structure to the discussion and asked for clarification on what is being asked of SWAC. She indicated that the same scenario has been laid out at several meetings.

Schlienz responded that the level of service is not acceptable at Houghton and the Division is overriding its own criteria and band aiding Houghton and Factoria.

Tessier asked if plans are currently to replace Factoria with a larger facility which would reduce capacity at which Houghton is operating.

321 Kiernan responded that the Division needs to work with the City of Bellevue on this. He said
322 that the permits approved by Bellevue for a new Factoria station are for a larger facility.

323

324 SchlienZ said that there are problems with Alternatives 2 and 4. Two does not fully
325 accommodate projected growth and while four accommodates growth it would still require
326 some demand management.

327

328 Kiernan said he would be happy to provide information at the next SWAC meeting.

329

330 **Beck said that the topic is a logical choice to be heard at the Facilities and Operations**
331 **(F&O) subcommittee meeting. Members agreed that the Northeast Lake Washington**
332 **Service Area strategy be added to the February F&O agenda.**

333

334 **Adjournment**

335 The meeting was adjourned at 11:20

336

337 Respectfully submitted,

338 Diane Yates

339 SWAC Staff Liaison

340 Strategic Planning Group

341 King County Solid Waste Division